

Applicant : Quellet et al.  
Sérial No. : 09/756,925  
Filed : January 9, 2001  
Page : 2

Attorney's Docket No.: 13580-032001

continuous process for producing active controlled release, discrete, solid particles embedded in a matrix material (Lengerich col. 4, lines 59-63). Lengerich's materials contemplate the use of a plasticized matrix material, into which is incorporated an "encapsulant". This "encapsulant" is the active component which is embedded within the plasticized matrix in a continuous process, and this "encapsulant" is thereby incorporated as discrete, solid particles within the matrix component (Lengerich, col. 7, lines 20-24). With regard to the delivery of this active component from within Lengerich's composition, Lengerich clearly points out that a hydrophobic agent can be used to slow down the release rate of the encapsulant from within the plasticizable matrix (Lengerich, col. 8, lines 38-4). Further additional components which are used to delay or prevent a fast release of the encapsulant from the matrix include those having a high water-binding capacity such that they "... may bind water which penetrates the particles, or prevent the water from dissolving the matrix, thereby preventing or delaying the release of the encapsulant from the matrix." (Lengerich col. 8, lines 62-65). At best then, it is clear that Lengerich teaches that his mechanism for the delivery of his active component ("encapsulant") contemplates the use of specific materials which control the dissolution rate of his plasticizable matrix.

Lengerich mentions also that film-building or film-forming substances can be used to coat his encapsulants prior to incorporation into his plasticizable matrix (Lengerich, col. 13, line 62-col. 14, line 24). Such is very clear from Lengerich when he notes that his encapsulate is pre-coated with a film-building material or a coating material by a process "... in conventional manner such as by spraying or enrobing using conventional coating equipment." (Lengerich, col. 16, lines 22-25). It is clear then that Lengerich contemplates that his coated encapsulants are those based on solid materials which are provided with a liquid coating, well prior to their incorporation into any subsequent matrix.

Nonetheless, nowhere within the four corners of the Lengerich reference is there a recitation or even a suggestion of the utility of first forming an aqueous, liquid oil-in-water emulsion which is first used to form a dispersed phase of oil droplets coated which in turn is distributed within an aqueous phase. Even more significantly, there is no recitation or even the remotest suggestion in the Lengerich reference of the utility of providing such an aqueous emulsion as a feed material to an extrusion/mixing process. Nowhere in the Lengerich reference is there a description of a process whereby an aqueous emulsified oil-in-water phase would be

Applicant : Quellet et al.  
Serial No. : 09/756,925  
Filed : January 9, 2001  
Page : 3

Attorney's Docket No.: 13580-032001

understood by one of skill in the art as a feedstock to an extrusion/mixing process. Accordingly, absent such a specific teaching, there is also no suggestion or teaching of the utility of such aqueous emulsions in such a mixing/extrusion process.

It is significant to point out that this failure on the part of Lengerich is not to be easily overlooked as indeed, it is fair to state that one of appropriate skill in the art seeking within the Lengerich reference for useful technical teaching would not be oblivious to the fact that Lengerich fails to teach or suggest the formation of such oil-in-water emulsions or the likely utility of such oil-in-water emulsions with Lengerich's matrix of materials. The careful reader would understand that a key factor of the success of Lengerich's compositions and their delivery is based on aqueous solubility of Lengerich's matrix, the same careful reader would understand why Lengerich would reasonably avoid the use of feedstocks or materials which included a significant proportion of water, as adding such water would defeat the controlled release characteristics which Lengerich provides by his matrix. As noted above, Lengerich needs to control the aqueous dissolution characteristics for his compositions for them to work properly; thus, adding in any component which is rich in water, such as an aqueous oil-in-water matrix would be expected to undermine the technical characteristics of Lengerich's compositions. This shortcoming clearly undermines the necessary link to the secondary references of Bilbrey and Saleeb relied upon by the Office.

Absent such a teaching or suggestion found in the four corners of the Lengerich reference, it is not believed appropriate for the continued reliance upon Lengerich as a primary teaching in maintaining the presently claimed invention as being obvious. In Winner International Royalty Corp. v. Wang 48 USPQ2d 1139, 1144 (DC DC, 1998) the Court held that "... there must have been some explicit teaching or suggestion in the art to motivate one of even ordinary skill to combine such elements so as to create the same invention." In the present application, Lengerich fails to teach or suggest the use of aqueous oil-in-water emulsions as a feedstock useful with his matrices and indeed, logically "teaches away" from the use of aqueous materials, which would be expected to detract from his controlled release properties. The Office is not permitted to overlook such a "teaching away" in the prior art but must consider the reference as a whole.

Applicant : Quellet et al.  
Serial No. : 09/756,925  
Filed : January 9, 2001  
Page : 4

Attorney's Docket No.: 13580-032001

"The relevant portions of a reference include not only those teachings which would suggest particular aspects of an invention to one having ordinary skill in the art, but also those teachings which would lead such a person away from the claimed invention. [...] The board's approach amounts, in substance, to nothing more than a hindsight 'reconstruction' of the claimed invention by relying on isolated teachings of the prior art without considering the overall context within which those teachings are presented. Without the benefit of appellant's disclosure, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not know what portions of the disclosure of the reference to consider and what portions to disregard as irrelevant."

In re Mercier 185 USPQ 774, 778 (CCPA, 1975)

It can be fairly stated then that only using a hindsight reconstruction, can one produce the Applicants' claimed invention from the assorted bits-and-pieces gleaned by the Examiner from the primary Lengerich, and the secondary, Saleeb and Bilbrey references and by ignoring the technical limitations of Lengerich's matrices. However, this hindsight reconstruction is also impermissible under the law. See W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc. 220 USPQ 303 (CAFC, 1983); In re Mercier 185 USPQ 774, 778 (CCPA, 1975); In re Geiger 2 USPQ2d 1276 (CAFC, 1987)

The Examiner continues to maintain a rejection based on the combination of the primary and secondary references stating that there is sufficient motivation within the secondary references to combine them with Lengerich. The Examiner points out that in Saleeb, there are discussed reduced oxidation and extended shelf life related to fine emulsion droplets.

The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the Saleeb reference, particularly the passage at page 660, lines 3 through page 661, line 8. It is the Applicants' view that the relevant portion of that specification as indicated relates to orange oils which have been encapsulated in a spray-drying process (page 660, line 8) which are dried solid particles and which are only subsequently mixed with the dry powder forming the major portion of Saleeb's matrix. For example, Saleeb describes at page 653, at the first full paragraph, his process wherein he unequivocally relates that "... these dry powders with or without flavors are fed automatically to a multi-zone extruder provided by specified die . . . as these components melt, the major component will dissolve in to the minor component, forming a viscous homogenous fluid which enrobes the flavored droplets added with powder, but preferably metered into the middle of the extruder." Thus, it can be clearly seen that Saleeb's techniques are related towards the formation of an extruded blend which has as starting materials, pulverent

Applicant : Quellet et al.  
Serial No. : 09/756,925  
Filed : January 9, 2001  
Page : 5

Attorney's Docket No.: 13580-032001

flavorants and pulvurent matrix materials. Nowhere in the four corners in the Saleeb reference is there a mention of an active ingredient in the form of an oil-in-water emulsion or where the oil droplets are covered by emulsifier film. The sole use of emulsifiers in Saleeb is recited at page 658, 659 wherein Saleeb discusses the selection of an emulsifier so to optimize the oil droplet distribution within the matrix.

Accordingly, it is not seen how the Saleeb reference, with its own inherent shortcomings, can be used to cure the fatal defects of the Lengerich reference discussed above. Neither of these documents satisfies the deficiency of the other. More particularly, neither document discusses the utility or the desirability of a oil-in-water emulsion which can be introduced into the barrel of an extruder or, wherein these emulsion droplets are mixed with the matrix composition and extruded to form a product having excellent release properties.

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner also continues to rely upon the secondary reference to Bilbrey as ostensibly teaching a method to form oil-in-water emulsion droplets, which however is used as a coating material to be applied onto a substrate by spraying. Bilbrey notes that desirably, his droplets have a relatively large size, preferably in the order from about 15-25 microns in diameter which can be achieved by adding a thickening agent soluble in the fragrance oil, especially the use of polyvinyl butyral (Bilbrey, col. 3, lines 10-50). Thereafter, these thickened oils are then combined with an aqueous solution of a water-soluble polymer binder such that the continuous phase is the aqueous solution of the water-soluble polymer binder, within which is a discontinuous phase formed of the thickened fragrance oil (Bilbrey col. 3, line 60-64). Thereafter, this composition is applied to a substrate such as pet litter (Bilbrey, col. 5, line 35-37).

While related to a coating composition, nothing in the Bilbrey reference would suggest to one of appropriate skill in the art of the utility of his compositions in any other manner or for any other use other than what is explicitly recited. This fact, coupled to the complete silence of Lengerich as to the utility of oil-in-water emulsions as a material useful for incorporation into his matrix by extrusion/mixing does not, in the Applicants' view, give rise to an appropriate ground for maintaining the outstanding rejection. Again, only by the impermissible of hindsight, or the use of the Applicants' own specification to teach the invention which is also prohibited, can the benefits of the Applicants' claimed invention be realized. In re Mercier, *supra*.

Applicant : Quellet et al.  
Sérial No. : 09/756,925  
Filed : January 9, 2001  
Page : 6

ney's Docket No.: 13580-032001

Accordingly, reconsideration of the propriety of the rejections based in view of the combined Lengerich, Saleeb, and Bilbrey references, and their withdrawals is requested.

In the Final Rejection the Office also rebuts an earlier argument raised by the Applicants concerning Saleeb's particle size, stating that Saleeb specifically teaches encapsulating liquid actives in the form of fine emulsion droplets having 1-15 microns in size and that this basis gives grounds to the continued rejection of the Applicants' claimed invention.

As pointed out above, the Applicants traverse this rejection, as Saleeb does not describe a water-in-oil emulsion which is added to a matrix material and combined by mixing/extrusion. As has been noted above, Saleeb's recitation of emulsifiers appears to be relevant only insofar as the addition of an emulsifier in Saleeb's melt formed well after his pulvurent feed materials have been supplied to his extruder. Saleeb's emulsifier, which he discusses at pages 658-659 refers only to the addition of an emulsifier to the essential oil which produces a fine emulsion when the flavorant is mixed with the melted substrate during extrusion. However, there is no recitation of the addition of an aqueous oil-in-water emulsion to his matrix material. Such is not the same as the Applicants' claimed invention, or their discovery of the improved benefits attendant upon the addition of a water-in-oil emulsion to a matrix in a mixing/extrusion operation. It cannot be seen how the Examiner can conclude, as the Examiner recites at page 5-6 of the outstanding Office Action that "... even if Saleeb failed to teach oil-in-water emulsion, which in the Examiner's view is not the case, a non-obviousness of the claimed invention should be shown in view of the combined references a whole. In this case, the encapsulation of oil-in-water microemulsion is taught by Bilbrey. The mere fact that Saleeb lacks the explicit mention of the type of its microemulsion does not necessarily render the claimed invention non-obvious."

The Applicants respectfully, but emphatically disagree with this line of reasoning. The proper test of obviousness is not one of the assemblage of the claimed invention by hindsight, which is impermissible, but what the combined references as a whole would have suggested to one of appropriate skill in the art. However, the Courts have long held that "It is wrong to use the patent in suit as a guide through the maze of prior art references, combining the right references in the right way so as to achieve the result of the claims in suit. Monday morning quarterbacking is quite improper when resolving the question of non-obviousness in a court of law." Orthopedic Equipment Company, Inc. et al. v. United States 217 USPQ 193 (CAFC, 1983)

Applicant : Quellet et al.  
Serial No. : 09/756,925  
Filed : January 9, 2001  
Page : 7

orney's Docket No.: 13580-032001

As discussed thoroughly above, none of the prior art references considered individually teach a process, or a product produced by a process wherein a liquid oil-in-water emulsion is added to a mixing/extrusion step, and subsequently forms a continuous matrix phase having embedded within a discontinuous phase of the oil. Lengerich is wholly silent as the utility of oil-in-water emulsions, and does not provide an appropriate teaching or suggestion for the use of such emulsions in his type of composition. Indeed, Lengerich can properly be said to "teach away" from the use of an aqueous component due to the nature of his matrix, and the need to maintain hydrophobicity in order to ensure controlled release of his "encapsulant". Saleeb fails to demonstrate an oil-in-water emulsion; at best, teaches only the benefits of dispersing his oils within the melted matrix present within his extruder. However, no oil-in-water emulsion is provided by Saleeb. Bilbrey's emulsions are not taught to be useful in any manner other than described by Bilbrey, namely in forming a coating which is deposited onto a substrate. There is no suggestion or motivation either in Bilbrey, or in Lengerich which would suggest the compatibility of the materials in each of these references. Indeed, it can be stated that the addition of any type of aqueous material would be seen as particularly detrimental to Lengerich's matrices which are particularly controlled or "tailored" to have specific hygroscopic properties to thereby control the release of Lengerich's "encapsulants". There would be an obvious technical prejudice, realized by one of appropriate skill in the art, to add any type of aqueous additive to Lengerich's matrix compositions as such would be expected to diminish or indeed destroy the efficacy of Lengerich's extruded compositions. Of course, such an aqueous composition of the type described by Bilbrey would be viewed as highly detrimental to Lengerich due to the aqueous content of Bilbrey's oil-in-water emulsions. As such, there no motivation to combine these references, but the inherent nature of Lengerich's matrices would induce this skilled practitioner to avoid the inclusion of any aqueous compositions.

In conclusion, the Applicants respectfully request full reconsideration of the outstanding grounds of rejection. See In re Eli Lilly Co. 14 USPQ2d 1741 (CAFC, 1990)

Reconsideration of the outstanding grounds of rejection and their withdrawal in view of the foregoing remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant : Quellet et al.  
Serial No. : 09/756,925  
Filed : January 9, 2001  
Page : 8

orney's Docket No.: 13580-032001.

Should the Examiner in charge of this application feel that communication with the Applicants' undersigned representative would advance the prosecution of this application, they are invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone/telefax numbers given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

*08 July 2002*

*Andrew N. Parfomak*

Andrew N. Parfomak  
Reg. No. 32,431

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
45 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 2800  
New York, New York 10111  
Telephone: (212) 765-5070  
Facsimile: (212) 258-2291